

III. REMARKS

An obvious error in the dependency of claim 6 has been corrected.

Independent claims 1 and 16 recite that a mobile station transmits a message comprising location information to the system and a management system which starts controlling the terminal on the basis of the message. Both of these features are missing in the combined teaching of Tiedemann and Hilsenrath.

As already noted in the previous response, and as the Examiner admits, Tiedemann does not disclose transmitting location features at all.

Hilsenrath discloses a location finding system where a base station utilizes multipath signals in order to determine the location of the terminal. Hilsenrath specifically teaches that, in the preferred embodiment of the invention, the location determining apparatus is situated in connection with the base station, see figures 10A to 10C and column 12, lines 36-39. Hilsenrath does not teach that a mobile terminal transmits a message to the system, the message comprising information about the location of the terminal. In fact, Hilsenrath specifically teaches away from this feature due to problems with multipath distortion. Thus the combination of Tiedemann and Hilsenrath teaches away from the invention as recited in the independent claims of the application. In particular, in the combination of Tiedemann and Hilsenrath, no message comprising location data is transmitted from the mobile terminal and no actions based on such a message are made in the system as recited in claims 1 and 16.

Therefore the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 16 and 18 under 35 USC 103 on these references should be withdrawn.

Similarly, Mills fails to show the claimed features. Thus the rejection of claims 8 and 17 under 35 USC 103 on Tiedemann in view of Hilsenrath and Mills should be withdrawn.


Also, Lee fails to disclose the claimed features. Thus the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.


Further Aarpola fails to disclose the above recited features. Thus the rejection of claims 11-15 and 19-22 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$110.00 is enclosed for a 1 month extension of time fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,


Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139


Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 5/14/03

Signature: 
Person Making Deposit